

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today is *not* binding
2 precedent of the Board
3

4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
5

6
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8 AND INTERFERENCES
9

10
11 *Ex parte* JAMES F. KOHLI
12

13
14 Appeal 2006-2577
15 Application 09/619,957
16 Technology Center 3600
17

18
19 Decided: July 24, 2007
20
21

22 *Before:* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, STUART S. LEVY and ANTON W.
23 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges.*
24

25 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*
26
27

28 DECISION ON APPEAL
29

30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellant appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection
32 of claims 1 to 37. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).
33

34 Appellant invented method for generating reports for management of
35 a medical facility (Specification 1).
36

Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

1. A method for generating reports for management of a medical facility, the method comprising the steps of:
(a) storing data representative of operation of a medical facility in a data repository operative in a first processing space;
(b) accessing data from the repository to populate a report;
(c) transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space separated from the first processing space by a security device; and
(d) generating the report in the second processing space based upon the transmitted data.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Montagna.

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Montagna et al.	4,899,292	Feb. 6, 1990
Wong et al.	6,260,021	Jul. 10, 2001

The Examiner contends that Wong discloses the invention as claimed except that Wong does not disclose:

(b) assessing data from the repository to populate a report,
(c) transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space separated from the first processing space, and
(d) generating the report in the second processing space based upon the transmitted data.

The Examiner relies on Montagna for teaching the steps not disclosed by Wong. In particular, the Examiner is of the opinion that the step of transmitting the accessed data to a second processing space separated from the first processing space is met by transmission of data from the Montagna

1 DRAM/SRAM (second processing space) to the central computer (437,
2 Figure 4) (first processing space).

3 Appellant contends that Montagna does not disclose transmitting
4 accessed data from a first processing space to a second processing space. In
5 particular, the Appellant contends that the DRAM/SRAM disclosed in
6 Montagna is not a processing space.

8 ISSUES

9 Has Appellant shown that the Examiner erred in finding that the
10 DRAM/SRAM space disclosed in Montagna is a processing space.

12 FINDINGS OF FACT

13 Appellants disclose that data is transferred from a second processing
14 space 56 to a first processing space 58 (Specification p. 7). The first
15 processing space 58 contains applications 62 which store, associate, analyze
16 and extract data from database 60 (Specification pages 7 to 8). Second
17 processing space 56 contains applications 68 which format and process
18 reports for the data received from processing space 58 (Specification, p 8).
19 The processing of the data by spaces 56 and 58 is also described in the
20 specification as accessing, analyzing and reporting (Specification, p. 7).

21 First and second processing spaces 56 and 58 do more than merely store the
22 data. The first and second processing spaces 56 and 58 manipulate the data.

23 Independent claims 1, 12, 19, 23, 29, 35 and 37 each recite
24 transmission of data from a first processing space to a second processing
25 space.

1 Montagna discloses a computerized system for storing and retrieving
2 document text, worksheets and associated graphics (col. 1, lines 6 to 8).
3 Montagna discloses a first processing space in the form of central computer
4 437. DRAM 72 and SRAM store worksheets. The worksheets are
5 transmitted to central computer 437 which processes the data on the
6 worksheets to estimate the cost of repairs based on the number of labor
7 hours, discount etc. (col. 14, line 50 to col. 15, line 2). DRAM and SRAM
8 are storage devices and do not process data.

9 A person of ordinary skill in the art would interpret the phrase
10 “processing space” to be a space where data is manipulated.
11

12 DISCUSSION

13 The DRAM and SRAM memory devices are not processing spaces
14 because data is merely stored rather than manipulated. Appellant clearly
15 discloses, and in our view a person of ordinary skill in the art would
16 understand a processing space to be a space where data is manipulated not
17 merely stored.

18 As Montagna does not disclose first and second processing spaces, we
19 will not sustain the Examiner’s rejection. The decision of the Examiner is
20 reversed.

21 REVERSED

22 JRG
23
24
25

Appeal 2006-2577
Application 09/619,957

- 1 Patrick S. Yoder
- 2 Suite 330
- 3 7915 FM 1960 West
- 4 Houston, TX 77070